264857US0PCT Docket No.

IN THE UNITED ST YES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: Tadayoshi IIJIMA

SERIAL NO: 10/521,780

GAU:

1771

FILED:

January 21, 2005

EXAMINER: ZIRKER, D.R.

FOR:

FUNCTIONAL FILM FOR TRANSFER HAVING FUNCTIONAL LAYER, OBJECT FURNISHED

WITH FUNCTIONAL LAYER AND PROCESS FOR PRODUCING THE SAME

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.136

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

| ☐ filing a response to the Official Action dated: ☐ responding to the requirements in the Notice of Allowability dated: ☐ filing the Formal Drawings. The Issue Fee due has been timely filed. ☐ responding to the Notice to File Missing Parts of Application dated: ☐ filing a Notice of Appeal. A timely response to the final rejection, due May 29, 2007 has been filed. ☐ filing an Appeal Brief. A Notice of Appeal was filed on: ☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27. Therefore, the fee amount shown below is reduced by one-half. The required fee of \$900.00, the difference between a three-month extension of time and a one-month extension time, is enclosed herewith by credit card payment and any further charges may be made against the Attorney of Record's Deposit Account No. 15-0030. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed. | It is hereby requested that a third month extension of time be granted to July 29, 2007 for | |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ filing the Formal Drawings. The Issue Fee due has been timely filed. ☐ responding to the Notice to File Missing Parts of Application dated: ☐ filing a Notice of Appeal. A timely response to the final rejection, due May 29, 2007 has been filed. ☐ filing an Appeal Brief. A Notice of Appeal was filed on: ☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27. Therefore, the fee amount shown below is reduced by one-half. The required fee of \$900.00, the difference between a three-month extension of time and a one-month extension time, is enclosed herewith by credit card payment and any further charges may be made against the Attorney of | | filing a response to the Official Action dated: |
| responding to the Notice to File Missing Parts of Application dated: filing a Notice of Appeal. A timely response to the final rejection, due May 29, 2007 has been filed. filing an Appeal Brief. A Notice of Appeal was filed on: Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27. Therefore, the fee amount shown below is reduced by one-half. The required fee of \$900.00, the difference between a three-month extension of time and a one-month extension time, is enclosed herewith by credit card payment and any further charges may be made against the Attorney of | | responding to the requirements in the Notice of Allowability dated: |
| filing a Notice of Appeal. A timely response to the final rejection, due May 29, 2007 has been filed. filing an Appeal Brief. A Notice of Appeal was filed on: Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27. Therefore, the fee amount shown below is reduced by one-half. The required fee of \$900.00, the difference between a three-month extension of time and a one-month extension time, is enclosed herewith by credit card payment and any further charges may be made against the Attorney of | | filing the Formal Drawings. The Issue Fee due has been timely filed. |
| ☐ filing an Appeal Brief. A Notice of Appeal was filed on: ☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27. Therefore, the fee amount shown below is reduced by one-half. The required fee of \$900.00, the difference between a three-month extension of time and a one-month extension time, is enclosed herewith by credit card payment and any further charges may be made against the Attorney of | | responding to the Notice to File Missing Parts of Application dated: |
| Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27. Therefore, the fee amount shown below is reduced by one-half. The required fee of \$900.00, the difference between a three-month extension of time and a one-month extension of time, is enclosed herewith by credit card payment and any further charges may be made against the Attorney of | | filing a Notice of Appeal. A timely response to the final rejection, due May 29, 2007 has been filed. |
| one-half. The required fee of \$900.00, the difference between a three-month extension of time and a one-month extens of time, is enclosed herewith by credit card payment and any further charges may be made against the Attorney of | | filing an Appeal Brief. A Notice of Appeal was filed on: |
| of time, is enclosed herewith by credit card payment and any further charges may be made against the Attorney of | | •• |
| | | |

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. Norman Doblon 111

Harris A. Pitlick

Registration No. 38,779

Customer Number

22850

Tel. (703) 413-3000 Fax. (703) 413-2220 (OSMMN 05/03)

07/31/2007 MAHHED1 00000015 10521780

92 FC:1253

988.88 OP